



## UNITED STATES AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY

### FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE COGSCREEN-AERONAUTICAL EDITION TEST BATTERY

Thomas R. Carretta

Malcolm James Ree

Training Effectiveness Branch  
Warfighter Training Research Division  
7909 Lindbergh Drive  
Brooks Air Force Base TX 78235-5352

Joseph D. Callister

USAF School of Aerospace Medicine  
Aeromedical Consult Service  
2507 Kennedy Circle  
Brooks Air Force Base TX 78235-5117

May 1999

19990909 147

Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.

AIR FORCE MATERIEL COMMAND  
AIR FORCE RESEARCH LABORATORY  
HUMAN EFFECTIVENESS DIRECTORATE  
WARFIGHTER TRAINING RESEARCH DIVISION  
6030 South Kent  
Mesa AZ 85212-6004

DTIC QUALITY INSPECTED 4

## NOTICES

Using Government drawings, specifications, or other data included in this document for any purpose other than Government-related procurement does not in any way obligate the US Government. The fact that the Government formulated or supplied the drawings, specifications, or other data, does not license the holder or any other person or corporation, or convey any rights or permission to manufacture, use, or sell any patented invention that may relate to them.

The Office of Public Affairs has reviewed this paper, and it is releasable to the National Technical Information Service, where it will be available to the general public, including foreign nationals.

This paper has been reviewed and is approved for publication.

**THOMAS R. CARRETTA**  
Project Scientist

**DEE H. ANDREWS**  
Technical Director

**JERALD L. STRAW, Colonel, USAF**  
Chief, Warfighter Training Research Division

Please notify AFRL/HEOP, 2509 Kennedy Circle, Brooks AFB, TX 78235-5118, if your address changes, or if you no longer want to receive our technical reports. You may write or call the STINFO Office at DSN 240-3877 or commercial (210) 536-3877, or e-mail [Shirley.Walker@afrlars.brooks.af.mil](mailto:Shirley.Walker@afrlars.brooks.af.mil)

# REPORT DOCUMENTATION PAGE

Form Approved  
OMB No. 0704-0188

Public reporting burden for this collection of information is estimated to average 1 hour per response, including the time for reviewing instructions, searching existing data sources, gathering and maintaining the data needed, and completing and reviewing the collection of information. Send comments regarding this burden estimate or any other aspect of this collection of information, including suggestions for reducing this burden, to Washington Headquarters Services, Directorate for Information Operations and Reports, 1215 Jefferson Davis Highway, Suite 1204, Arlington, VA 22202-4302, and to the Office of Management and Budget, Paperwork Reduction Project (0704-0188), Washington, DC 20503.

|   |   |  |  |
|---|---|--|--|
| 1. AGENCY USE ONLY (Leave blank)  |   | 2. REPORT DATE<br>May 1999                                     | 3. REPORT TYPE AND DATES COVERED<br>Final - March 1995 to October 1997           |
| 4. TITLE AND SUBTITLE<br><br>Factor Structure of the CogScreen-Aeronautical Edition Test Battery  |   |  | 5. FUNDING NUMBERS<br><br>PE - 62202F<br>PR - 1123<br>TA - B1<br>WU - 01         |
| 6. AUTHOR(S)<br><br>Carretta, Thomas R., Ree, Malcolm James, & *Callister, J.D.   |   |  | 8. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION<br>REPORT NUMBER                                      |
| 7. PERFORMING ORGANIZATION NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)<br><br>Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate<br>Warfighter Training Research Division, Training Effectiveness Branch<br>7909 Lindbergh Drive; Brooks Air Force Base TX 78235-5352<br>*USAF School of Aerospace Medicine<br>2507 Kennedy Circle; Brooks AFB TX 78235-5117  |   |  | 10. SPONSORING/MONITORING<br>AGENCY REPORT NUMBER<br><br>AFRL-HE-AZ-TR-1998-0076 |
| 9. SPONSORING/MONITORING AGENCY NAME(S) AND ADDRESS(ES)<br><br>Air Force Research Laboratory<br>Human Effectiveness Directorate<br>Warfighter Training Research Division<br>6030 South Kent<br>Mesa AZ 85212-6004   |   |  |  |
| 11. SUPPLEMENTARY NOTES<br><br>Air Force Research Laboratory Technical Monitor: Dr Thomas R. Carretta, (937) 656-7014; DSN 986-7014   |   |  |  |
| 12a. DISTRIBUTION/AVAILABILITY STATEMENT<br><br>Approved for public release; distribution is unlimited.   |   |  | 12b. DISTRIBUTION CODE   |
| 13. ABSTRACT (Maximum 200 words)<br><br>CogScreen-Aeronautical Edition (CogScreen-AE) is a computerized test designed to assess cognitive functioning. The US Air Force (USAF) is evaluating its utility for establishing a cognitive baseline for pilots that would assist clinicians when evaluating pilots with cognitive referral, which could result in impaired flying ability. To better understand what is measured by the CogScreen-AE, confirmatory factor analyses were performed. Participants were 1,015 USAF pilot training applicants. Like many cognitive tests, CogScreen-AE exhibited a hierarchical factor structure. Somewhat unusual was that there was not a strong, single, higher order factor representing general cognitive ability. Instead, there were two higher order factors that measured response efficiency and procedural knowledge. In addition to the higher order factors, there were six first-order factors representing thuput, response speed, shifting attention, psychomotor tracking, pathfinder, and numeric. |   |  |  |
| 14. SUBJECT TERMS<br>Cognitive ability; Cognitive functioning; Cogscreen-Aeronautical Edition; Cogscreen-AE;<br>Pilot selection; Pilot training; Test battery; Tests;   |   |  | 15. NUMBER OF PAGES<br>21  |
|   |   |  | 16. PRICE CODE   |
| 17. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF REPORT<br><br>Unclassified  | 18. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF THIS PAGE<br><br>Unclassified | 19. SECURITY CLASSIFICATION<br>OF ABSTRACT<br><br>Unclassified | 20. LIMITATION ABSTRACT<br><br>UL  |

NSN 7540-01-280-5500

Standard Form 298 (Rev 2-89)  
Prescribed by ANSI Std Z-39-18  
298-102 COMPUTER GENERATED

## CONTENTS

|                              | Page |
|------------------------------|------|
| SUMMARY .....                | 1    |
| INTRODUCTION .....           | 1    |
| METHOD .....                 | 2    |
| Participants .....           | 2    |
| Measures .....               | 2    |
| Procedures .....             | 6    |
| RESULTS AND DISCUSSION ..... | 7    |
| REFERENCES .....             | 13   |

## FIGURES

### Figure No.

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Factor Structure of the CogScreen-AE Test Battery ..... | 12 |
|---|---|----|

## TABLES

### Table No.

|   |   |    |
|---|---|----|
| 1 | Brief Descriptions of CogScreen-AE Tests .....                | 3  |
| 2 | Means and Standard Deviations .....                           | 7  |
| 3 | Correlation Matrix .....                                      | 9  |
| 4 | Factor Loadings for 6-Factor First-Order Model .....          | 10 |
| 5 | Correlations among First-Order Factors (6-Factor Model) ..... | 11 |

## PREFACE

This effort was conducted under Work Unit 1123-B1-01, Pilot Selection and Classification Support, in support of aircrew selection and classification research and development at the Air Force Research Laboratory, Human Effectiveness Directorate, Warfighter Training Research Division (AFRL/HEA), Brooks Air Force Base, TX. The laboratory work unit monitor was Dr Thomas R. Carretta. Dr Carretta is currently associated with AFRL/HECI at Wright-Patterson Air Force Base, OH. He may be reached via e-mail at [thomas.carretta@he.wpafb.af.mil](mailto:thomas.carretta@he.wpafb.af.mil).

We would like to thank SSgt Pauline Etterle for her assistance in reviewing the CogScreen-AE battery, and thank Dr Andrea Berndt for her help in specifying the LISREL models.

# FACTOR STRUCTURE OF THE COGSCREEN-AE TEST BATTERY

## SUMMARY

CogScreen Aeronautical Edition (CogScreen-AE) is a computerized test designed to assess cognitive functioning. The US Air Force (USAF) is evaluating its utility for establishing a cognitive baseline for pilots that would assist clinicians when evaluating pilots with cognitive referral, which could result in impaired flying ability. To better understand what is measured by the CogScreen-AE, confirmatory factor analyses were performed. Participants were 1,015 USAF pilot training applicants. Like many cognitive tests, CogScreen-AE exhibited an hierarchical factor structure. Somewhat unusual was that there was not a strong, single, higher order factor representing general cognitive ability. Instead, there were two higher order factors that measured response efficiency and procedural knowledge. In addition to the higher order factors, there were six first-order factors representing thurput, response speed, shifting attention, psychomotor tracking, pathfinder, and numeric.

## INTRODUCTION

Ability tests have long been used in the selection of pilots, especially in the military (Hilton & Dolgin, 1991; Ree & Carretta, 1996). These tests have been both cognitive and psychomotor and have been administered via paper-and-pencil and by computer (Ree & Carretta, 1998). Another use for ability tests is to detect minimal brain dysfunction. The US Federal Aviation Administration (FAA) called for such a test in 1987. This study investigated the factor structure of a computerized test designed for detecting deficits in the cognitive functioning of pilots due to minimal brain dysfunction.

CogScreen-Aeromedical Edition (CogScreen-AE) (Kay, 1995) is a computer-based cognitive ability test intended to assess changes or deficits in cognitive, information processing, and perceptual abilities (e.g., attention, memory, reaction time, simultaneous information processing). It was initially designed to detect subtle changes in cognitive functioning of aviation pilots that could result in impaired flying ability (Kay, 1995). Unlike other tests of aviation aptitude, CogScreen-AE does not measure aviation knowledge (e.g., Air Force Officer Qualifying Test or AFOQT) (Carretta & Ree, 1996) or flying skills (e.g., Canadian Automated Pilot Selection System or CAPSS) (Spinner, 1991). Rather, it focuses on the measurement of cognitive, information processing, and perceptual abilities hypothesized to be related to flying performance (Imhoff & Levine, 1981). The US Air Force (USAF) is evaluating the utility of the CogScreen-AE battery along with a computerized version of the Multidimensional Aptitude Battery (MAB) (Jackson, Barton, & Blokker, 1992) for establishing a cognitive baseline for student pilots (Callister, King, & Retzlaff, 1995; Retzlaff, Callister, & King, 1996).

Kay (1995) conducted exploratory factor analyses of 28 CogScreen-AE scores for an international sample of 662 United States and Russian pilots. Principal components analysis with Varimax rotation was used. A 9-factor solution was generated that accounted for 67.1% of the

variance. The factors were: (1) visual scanning and sequencing, (2) attribute identification, (3) visual perceptual and spatial processing, (4) motor coordination, (5) choice visual reaction time, (6) visual associative memory, (7) tracking, (8) working memory, and (9) numerical operations. The factors were not allowed to correlate, as an orthogonal solution was specified. However, interpretation of these factors is questionable. Four of the nine factors were underspecified (i.e., represented by two or fewer scores). Finally, Kay did not test the statistical goodness-of-fit of his factor model in his exploratory factor analysis.

The purposes of this study were to test the goodness-of-fit of Kay's factor model and to establish and test the goodness-of-fit of two alternate factor models of the CogScreen-AE as established by cumulative psychometric research on ability tests (Carretta & Ree, 1996, 1997; Carretta, Retzlaff, Callister, & King, 1998; Jensen, 1980; Ree & Carretta, 1994; Stauffer, Ree, & Carretta, 1996; Vernon, 1969).

## METHOD

### *Participants*

Participants were 1,015 US Air Force pilot training applicants. The mean age at time of testing was 20.5 years. The sample was predominantly male (91.9%) and White (88.4%). Participants were tested as a requirement for entrance into the US Air Force Enhanced Flight Screening Program. This program teaches basic flying skills and is used to determine which applicants should attend jet aircraft training.

The protocol for the current study had been reviewed and approved by the Air Force Human Use Committee of the Air Force Medical Operations Agency. Informed consent was obtained from participants before their participation.

### *Measures*

The CogScreen-AE tests were administered on a 386-based computer with a 14-inch color monitor. Participants entered their responses using a keypad and mouse or light pen. Table 1 provides the test developer's brief summary of the attributes measured by the CogScreen-AE tests and the types of scores generated for each test. Most of the tests include percent correct, median response time for items answered correctly, and thruput. Thruput is defined as a measure of response efficiency and reflects the number of correct responses per minute (Kay, 1995, p.8). Some CogScreen-AE tests (i.e., Divided Attention, Pathfinder, Selective Attention, and Dual Task) include various process-oriented, qualitative, or response error measures that cannot be classified as accuracy, speed, or thruput. Brief descriptions of the tests follow. Kay (1995) provided detailed test descriptions and scoring procedures.

*Backward digit span.* This test is similar to the backward digit span task found in the Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised (WAIS-R) (Wechsler, 1981). In this test, participants are sequentially presented with a series of 3 to 6 digits. Their task is to reproduce the sequence in reverse order. The score is the percent of series recalled in correct reverse order (BDSACC).



*Math.* This test consists of traditional multistep word problems. Scores include percent correct (MATHACC), median response time on items answered correctly (MATHRTC), and thruput (i.e., MATHPUT, number of problems answered correctly per minute).

Table 1. Brief Descriptions of CogScreen-AE Tests

| Test                         | Abbreviation | Attributes Measured   | Types of Scores  |
|------------------------------|--------------|---|--|
| Backward Digit Span          | BDS          | verbal sequential processing, visual attention, & working memory                                      | response accuracy  |
| Math                         | MATH         | math skills, reading comprehension, reasoning, & working memory                                       | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Visual Sequence Comparison   | VSC          | verbal sequential processing, visual attention, visual perceptual speed, & working memory             | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Symbol Digit Coding          | SDC          | attention, immediate and delayed memory, information processing                                       | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Matching-to-Sample           | MTS          | spatial processing, visual-perceptual speed, & working memory   | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Manikin                      | MAN          | spatial orientation & visual-spatial perception   | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Divided Attention            | DAT          | choice reaction time, divided attention, multitasking, & working memory                               | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Auditory Sequence Comparison | ASC          | auditory attention, sound pattern discrimination, & working memory                                    | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Pathfinder                   | PF           | ability to shift mental set, memory, motor coordination, organizing and sequencing, & visual scanning | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Shifting Attention           | SAT          | application of rules, choice reaction time, concept formation, deductive reasoning, & working memory  | response accuracy, response speed, & thruput                 |
| Dual Task                    | DTT          | divided attention, multitasking, & working memory   | response accuracy, response speed, thruput, & tracking error |

*Visual sequence comparison.* Two alphanumeric strings are simultaneously presented side-by-side on the screen. Participants must determine whether the strings are the same or different. String length varies from 4 to 8 characters. Performance measures include percent correct (VSCACC), response time for correctly answered items (VSCRTC), and thruput (VSCPUT).



*Symbol digit coding.* This test consists of three tasks: (1) symbol-digit coding, (2) immediate recall, and (3) delayed recall. The symbol-digit coding task is a computer-based analogue of Digit Symbol test from the WAIS-R (Wechsler, 1981). In this task, six symbol-digit pairs are shown at the top of the screen. The pairs remain on the screen throughout the symbol-digit-coding task. Participants are instructed to remember the symbol-digit pairs for a later memory test (immediate and delayed recall tasks; see below). Meanwhile, in the center of the screen, a row of symbols is shown with blank spaces below each symbol. Participants enter the digit that corresponds to each symbol. Scores include accuracy (SDCACC), and the number of items completed correctly per minute (i.e., thruput, SDCPUT).

The immediate recall task measures the ability to recall the symbol-digit pairs presented in the first part of the test. The six symbols used in the symbol-digit-coding task are presented. Participants are required to remember the corresponding digit. Response accuracy (SDCIRACC) is the only score.

The delayed recall task is identical to the immediate recall task, except that it is presented after the Pathfinder test. As with the immediate recall task, the only score is response accuracy (SDCDRACC).

*Matching-to-sample.* Participants are shown a 4 x 4 grid of filled and empty cells (i.e., target grid). After a brief presentation, the target grid is removed and replaced by two grids that are displayed side-by-side on the screen. One pattern is identical to the target grid while the other differs in 1 of the 16 cells. Participants must choose the grid matching the target grid. Scores include accuracy (MTSACC), response time (MTSRTC), and thruput (MTSPUT).

*Manikin.* This test is based on a spatial transformation task described by Benson and Gedye (1963). Participants are presented with a male figure in one of four positions. The image can be either right side up or upside down and facing toward or facing away. The figure holds a flag in one hand. Participants must determine which hand (right or left) is holding the flag. Test performance is scored for accuracy (MANACC), speed (MANRTC), and thruput (MANPUT).

*Divided attention test.* This test has two parts: (1) a visual indicator monitoring task and (2) the visual indicator monitoring task presented simultaneously with the Visual Sequence Comparison task (see above). In the first part (visual monitoring alone task), participants watch a cursor move vertically within a circle divided into upper, central, and lower sections. When the cursor moves from the central section into either the upper or lower section, participants touch a box labeled "CENTER" with a light pen to recenter the cursor. Scores include the median amount of time the cursor spends in either the upper or lower sections before being recentered (DATIRTC) and the number of premature (i.e., anticipatory) responses (DATIPRE).

In part 2 (dual-task), the visual indicator-monitoring task is paired with the Visual Sequence Comparison task. Performance measures include response speed (DATDRTC) and number of premature responses (DATDPRE) for the indicator monitoring task and response accuracy (DATSCACC), response speed (DATSCRTC), and thruput (DATSCPUT) for the visual sequence comparison task.

*Auditory sequence comparison.* This test involves the comparison of two series of 4 to 8 tones. The series are presented sequentially and may be identical or differ in the pitch of one tone. Participants make a "SAME" or "DIFFERENT" judgment for each pair. Scores include accuracy (ASCACC), response speed (ASCRTC), and thruput (ASCPUT).

*Pathfinder.* Participants are taught three sequencing rules regarding numbers, letters, and a combination of numbers and letters. For each item, a number or letter is shown in the center of the screen. Participants choose from among four characters (numbers and/or letters), the one that should appear next in the sequence. Three of the four character choices are updated following each response.

There are separate accuracy, speed, thruput, and coordination scores for letter, number, and "combination" items. The response accuracy scores are PFLACC (letters), PFNACC (numbers), and PFCACC (combined). The median response time scores are PFLMRT (letters), PFNMRT (numbers), and PFCMRT (combined). The thruput scores are PFLPUT (letters), PFNPUT (numbers), and PFCPUT (combined). Coordination scores measure participants proximity to the center of the target numbers and letters and include PFLCOOR (letters), PFNCOOR (numbers), and PFCCOOR (combined).

*Shifting attention test.* In this test, participants must alter their responses depending on rule changes. Under Rule 1, boxes are selected based on the color of their borders. Under Rule 2, boxes are selected based on the direction of their arrow, and under Rule 3, they are selected based on the color of their arrow. The test items begin after the three rules have been presented and a practice session completed. During the first group of test items, one of the rules is shown before each item. In the second group of test items (discovery), participants must discover, and then apply, the active response rule, which changes after a variable number of correct answers. During the discovery items, participants must use trial-and-error to determine the active rule.

Response accuracy, speed, and thruput are measured for all tasks in this test. Additional scores for the discovery items include number of shifts completed (SATDIRUL), failures to maintain set (SATDIFAI), number of nonconceptual responses (SATDINON), and number of perseverative errors (SATDIPER).

*Dual task.* This test is similar to various measures of time-sharing ability (see, for example, Carretta & Ree, 1993; North & Gopher, 1976). In this test, participants must learn to separately perform a tracking task and a memory task, then perform both simultaneously. In the first part (compensatory tracking alone), participants use the left and right arrow keys to keep a cursor in the center of the screen. Without intervention, the cursor will drift off the screen causing a "boundary hit." Scores for part 1 include mean absolute tracking error (DTTAABS) and the number of boundary hits (DTTAHIT).

The second part involves a delayed recall task. In this task, participants are shown the numbers 1, 2, or 3. The first number is then replaced by a 1, 2, or 3. Participants must recall the previous number shown and select it (using a light pen), while simultaneously mentally encoding

the current number for the next item presentation. Performance measures include accuracy (DTTPAACC), response speed (DTTPARTC), and thruput (DTTPAPUT). The third part simultaneously presents the tracking and delayed recall tasks. Scores include tracking error (DTTDABS), boundary hits (DTTDHIT), recall accuracy (DTTPDACC), response speed (DTTPDRTC), and thruput (DTTPDPUT).

### *Procedures*

Participants completed the CogScreen-AE tests shortly before beginning the USAF Enhanced Flight Screening Program. CogScreen-AE testing was done to establish an ideographic cognitive baseline for the clinical evaluation of pilots for comparative purposes after sustaining a head injury or other neurological insult (Retzlaff, et al., 1996).

Analyses included descriptive statistics, correlations, and confirmatory factor analyses. Because the participants had been selected, at least in part, on the basis of aptitude test scores, they constituted a range-restricted sample. Such samples provide relatively poor statistical estimates of the relations between variables (Thorndike, 1949). The multivariate correction method (Lawley, 1943; Ree, Carretta, Earles, & Albert, 1994) was used to correct the means, standard deviations, and correlations for the effects of prior selection to a US Air Force applicant sample (Skinner & Ree, 1987). The corrected correlation matrix was used in the confirmatory factor analyses.

Kay (1995) lists 65 summary scores from the CogScreen-AE tests (19 accuracy, 19 speed, 16 thruput, and 11 process-oriented). As noted earlier, the thruput scores are linear transformations of the accuracy and speed scores. Therefore, it would be inappropriate to include accuracy and speed scores in confirmatory factor analyses with thruput scores based on the same test items. We chose to follow Kay's lead by focusing on the same 28 scores as used in his previous exploratory factor analysis (3 accuracy, 5 speed, 12 thruput, and 8 process scores). Several models were specified, parameters estimated, and the goodness-of-fit to the data was tested. Hierarchical confirmatory factor analyses were performed using LISREL 8 (Jöreskog & Sörbom, 1996).

Model 1 consisted of the nine first-order orthogonal factors described by Kay (1995). Model 2 was identical to Model 1 except that the first-order factors were allowed to correlate as is usually found in cognitive ability tests. Model 3 was a simple, more parsimonious model with six first-order factors. Some of these factors were developed by grouping similar types of scores across tests (i.e., thruput, response time, tracking, numerical), while others represented specific CogScreen-AE tests with multiple scores per test (i.e., Shifting Attention has 7 scores, Pathfinder has 6 scores, etc.). The first-order confirmatory factor analyses (CFAs) allowed all observed variables (28 CogScreen-AE scores) to load on their first-order factors. This retains the factor influence on all scores and was necessary to conduct the latter hierarchical CFAs based on the correlations of the six first-order factors.

Two goodness-of-fit indices were computed to test the goodness of the models. These were the Comparative Fit Index (CFI) (Bentler, 1990) and Root Mean Square Error of

Approximation (RMSEA) (Browne & Cudeck, 1993). Values above .90 for the CFI and below .08 for the RMSEA are considered indicators of acceptable fit.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The sample data were corrected for range restriction. The means and standard deviations are presented in Table 2 and the correlation matrix is presented in Table 3. As would be expected in selected samples, after correction for range restriction, the means decreased and the standard deviations increased. In general, these changes were small. After correction for range restriction, the correlations increased, but again by only a small amount. Because the Air Force participants were selected on highly g-loaded tests, this suggests that the CogScreen-AE is not heavily g-loaded. If it were, the restriction caused by incidental selection would have been greater (Thorndike, 1949) leading to larger differences between pre- and post-correction values. All confirmatory factor models were estimated using the corrected data.

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations

| Score                             | Abbr.    | Mean  | SD    | Mean  | SD    |
|-----------------------------------|----------|-------|-------|-------|-------|
| <u>Backward Digit Span</u>        |          |       |       |       |       |
| 1. Accuracy                       | BDSACC   | 0.85  | 0.17  | 0.81  | 0.18  |
| <u>Math</u>                       |          |       |       |       |       |
| 2. Thruput                        | MATHPUT  | 2.19  | 0.98  | 1.86  | 1.09  |
| <u>Visual Sequence Comparison</u> |          |       |       |       |       |
| 3. Thruput                        | VCSPUT   | 29.84 | 6.65  | 29.10 | 6.77  |
| <u>Symbol Digit Coding</u>        |          |       |       |       |       |
| 4. Thruput                        | SDCPUT   | 76.63 | 23.62 | 72.04 | 24.17 |
| 5. Immediate Recall Acc.          | SDCIRACC | 0.12  | 0.31  | 0.11  | 0.31  |
| <u>Matching-to-Sample</u>         |          |       |       |       |       |
| 6. Thruput                        | MTSPUT   | 49.47 | 10.26 | 47.53 | 10.29 |
| <u>Manikin</u>                    |          |       |       |       |       |
| 7. Thruput                        | MANPUT   | 34.27 | 8.94  | 30.97 | 9.19  |
| <u>Divided Attention Test</u>     |          |       |       |       |       |
| 8. Sequence Comparison Thruput    | DATSCPUT | 27.43 | 7.01  | 26.69 | 7.11  |
| 9. Indicator "Alone" RT           | DATIRTC  | 0.37  | 0.09  | 0.37  | 0.09  |
| 10. Indicator "Dual" RT           | DATDRTC  | 0.63  | 0.19  | 0.63  | 0.20  |

Table 2. Means and Standard Deviations (Cont'd)

| Score                               | Abbr.    | Mean   | SD     | Mean   | SD     |
|-------------------------------------|----------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
| <u>Auditory Sequence Comp.</u>      |          |        |        |        |        |
| 11. Thruput                         | ASCPUT   | 92.90  | 27.10  | 90.25  | 27.25  |
| <u>Pathfinder</u>                   |          |        |        |        |        |
| 12. Letter RT                       | PFLRTC   | 0.70   | 0.18   | 0.71   | 0.18   |
| 13. Number RT                       | PFNRTC   | 0.76   | 0.23   | 0.77   | 0.23   |
| 14. Combined RT                     | PFCRTC   | 1.03   | 0.30   | 1.10   | 0.31   |
| 15. Letter Coordination             | PFLCOOR  | 3.44   | 7.86   | 3.47   | 7.86   |
| 16. Number Coordination             | PFNCOOR  | 3.50   | 8.55   | 3.45   | 8.55   |
| 17. Combined Coordination           | PFCCOOR  | 3.36   | 7.81   | 3.44   | 7.81   |
| <u>Shifting Attention Test</u>      |          |        |        |        |        |
| 18. Arrow Direction Thruput         | SATADPUT | 105.70 | 21.95  | 103.60 | 21.95  |
| 19. Discovery Rule Shifts           | SATDIRUL | 6.85   | 2.67   | 5.92   | 2.80   |
| 20. Discovery Rule Accuracy         | SATDIACC | 4.71   | 16.28  | 2.92   | 16.33  |
| 21. Discovery Failures              | SATDIFAI | 2.12   | 1.91   | 2.75   | 1.98   |
| 22. Discovery Perseverative Errors  | SATDIPER | 1.76   | 2.22   | 1.71   | 2.22   |
| 23. Instruction Thruput             | SATINPUT | 83.56  | 17.43  | 79.93  | 17.52  |
| 24. Arrow Color Thruput             | SATACPUT | 98.26  | 17.56  | 95.99  | 17.58  |
| <u>Dual Task</u>                    |          |        |        |        |        |
| 25. Tracking "Alone" Error          | DTTAABS  | 15.25  | 13.68  | 17.82  | 14.00  |
| 26. Tracking "Dual" Error           | DTTDABS  | 45.16  | 26.82  | 52.22  | 27.56  |
| 27. Previous Number "Alone" Thruput | DTTPAPUT | 153.23 | 186.40 | 152.37 | 186.70 |
| 28. Previous Number "Dual" Thruput  | DTTPDPUT | 121.49 | 157.44 | 102.53 | 157.96 |

Note. Means and standard deviations were corrected for range restriction using the multivariate method (Lawley, 1943).

The results of the CFA of Model 1 (Kay's [1995] 9-factor orthogonal model) indicated a poor fit. The CFI was .194 and the RMSEA was .207. This was not a surprising result for an orthogonal (uncorrelated) model as there is a long history of correlated abilities stretching back to the founding of factor analysis (Spearman, 1904).

Model 2, an oblique or correlated factors version of Model 1, fared considerably better. The CFI was .958 and the RMSEA was .049, both indicative of an acceptable fit. However, one of the correlations among the factors exceeded 1.0, probably a consequence of model misspecification. It is apparent that this model does not fit the data thus rendering the interpretation of the fit indexes moot. Kay's (1995) 9-factor model, whether orthogonal or oblique, does not offer a good fit to the data.

Table 3. Correlation Matrix

| Score | 1    | 2    | 3    | 4    | 5    | 6    | 7    | 8    | 9    | 10   | 11   | 12   | 13   | 14   | 15   | 16   | 17   | 18   | 19   | 20   | 21   | 22   | 23   | 24   | 25   | 26   | 27   | 28   |
|-------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|------|
| 1     | 1000 | 161  | 028  | 044  | 062  | -011 | 090  | -013 | -012 | -002 | 033  | -057 | -059 | -138 | 056  | 042  | 054  | 009  | 092  | -014 | -092 | -019 | 076  | 049  | -139 | -121 | -001 | 009  |
| 2     | 232  | 1000 | 158  | 291  | -223 | 121  | 144  | 151  | -045 | -102 | 124  | -099 | -101 | -277 | -188 | -175 | -190 | 090  | 144  | -012 | -095 | 015  | 172  | 098  | -139 | -111 | 013  | 054  |
| 3     | 068  | 215  | 1000 | 371  | -205 | 487  | 267  | 571  | -280 | -317 | 332  | -345 | -308 | -369 | -185 | -176 | -185 | 382  | 077  | 081  | -011 | -033 | 446  | 403  | -090 | -044 | 132  | 132  |
| 4     | 090  | 348  | 389  | 1000 | -710 | 433  | 351  | 274  | -247 | -277 | 415  | -330 | -321 | -426 | -602 | -574 | -603 | 431  | 097  | 063  | -072 | -027 | 503  | 385  | -262 | -126 | 124  | 156  |
| 5     | 060  | -197 | -192 | -689 | 1000 | -339 | -258 | -159 | 117  | 172  | -412 | 234  | 228  | 300  | 811  | 769  | 812  | -349 | -035 | -094 | 034  | 021  | -346 | -244 | 299  | 095  | -051 | -081 |
| 6     | 017  | 157  | 491  | 442  | -331 | 1000 | 336  | 321  | -392 | -247 | 420  | -400 | -356 | -382 | -285 | -283 | -283 | 507  | -010 | 035  | 005  | -025 | 559  | 515  | -117 | -089 | 207  | 215  |
| 7     | 134  | 221  | 293  | 381  | -248 | 352  | 1000 | 212  | -246 | -200 | 291  | -278 | -216 | -273 | -199 | -179 | -198 | 371  | 012  | 009  | -003 | -083 | 404  | 370  | -163 | -128 | 128  | 130  |
| 8     | 018  | 195  | 583  | 293  | -152 | 330  | 232  | 1000 | -223 | -275 | 242  | -244 | -211 | -272 | -133 | -123 | -132 | 236  | 032  | 008  | -011 | -044 | 310  | 272  | -050 | -002 | 095  | 048  |
| 9     | -012 | -034 | -271 | -237 | 112  | -385 | -238 | -218 | 1000 | 479  | -186 | 461  | 361  | 314  | 080  | 063  | 079  | -566 | 028  | -132 | -017 | 001  | -555 | -566 | 043  | 045  | -184 | -156 |
| 10    | -019 | -121 | -324 | -282 | 166  | -248 | -209 | -282 | 476  | 1000 | -184 | 287  | 251  | 272  | 138  | 128  | 139  | -358 | -023 | -061 | 006  | 017  | -370 | -360 | 096  | 081  | -104 | -095 |
| 11    | 053  | 144  | 339  | 419  | -406 | 422  | 299  | 249  | -182 | -189 | 1000 | -268 | -226 | -291 | -346 | -326 | -348 | 384  | 035  | 029  | -015 | -038 | 409  | 335  | -209 | -083 | 134  | 178  |
| 12    | -074 | -120 | -351 | -355 | 229  | -402 | -287 | -252 | 458  | 290  | -271 | 1000 | 784  | 528  | 193  | 212  | 195  | -547 | -026 | -094 | 054  | 002  | -549 | -556 | 049  | 031  | -176 | -161 |
| 13    | -083 | -137 | -321 | -334 | 222  | -363 | -234 | -224 | 357  | 257  | -232 | 785  | 1000 | 463  | 188  | 288  | 193  | -456 | -029 | -061 | 057  | -004 | -452 | -455 | 047  | 056  | -131 | -136 |
| 14    | -195 | -370 | -398 | -457 | 277  | -390 | -320 | -300 | 293  | 279  | -298 | 523  | 471  | 1000 | 260  | 250  | 259  | -407 | -037 | -066 | 033  | 068  | -509 | -472 | 140  | 109  | -144 | -139 |
| 15    | 047  | -182 | -180 | -592 | 810  | -281 | -199 | -131 | 075  | 136  | -344 | 190  | 186  | 250  | 1000 | 934  | 996  | -281 | -077 | -081 | 067  | 025  | -311 | -188 | 250  | 060  | -046 | -068 |
| 16    | 033  | -171 | -173 | -565 | 767  | -280 | -180 | -123 | 058  | 128  | -325 | 210  | 286  | 243  | 933  | 1000 | 934  | -258 | -081 | -080 | 071  | 012  | -296 | -173 | 222  | 057  | -032 | -066 |
| 17    | 045  | -185 | -181 | -593 | 811  | -280 | -199 | -131 | 074  | 137  | -346 | 193  | 192  | 251  | 996  | 934  | 1000 | -280 | -077 | -080 | 066  | 027  | -308 | -187 | 250  | 059  | -044 | -066 |
| 18    | 019  | 093  | 378  | 424  | -345 | 503  | 369  | 234  | -563 | -355 | 384  | -545 | -455 | -394 | -278 | -256 | -278 | 1000 | -016 | 109  | 023  | -026 | 703  | 754  | -115 | -069 | 163  | 190  |
| 19    | 146  | 251  | 123  | 158  | -036 | 027  | 080  | 069  | 029  | -044 | 061  | -047 | -059 | -124 | -088 | -092 | -089 | -003 | 1000 | 059  | -802 | 009  | -015 | -039 | -081 | -119 | 012  | 035  |
| 20    | -004 | 010  | 085  | 073  | -095 | 042  | 022  | 011  | -132 | -064 | 035  | -097 | -065 | -077 | -085 | -084 | -084 | 111  | 075  | 1000 | -038 | 009  | 097  | 094  | -009 | 003  | 090  | -008 |
| 21    | -139 | -192 | -055 | -127 | 035  | -029 | -062 | -044 | -017 | 024  | -039 | 071  | 082  | 108  | 078  | 082  | 078  | 012  | -817 | -053 | 1000 | -027 | 019  | 046  | 057  | 086  | 001  | -022 |
| 22    | -018 | 017  | -030 | -023 | 019  | -022 | -079 | -044 | -001 | 016  | -035 | 001  | -004 | 062  | 022  | 010  | 023  | -024 | 012  | 011  | -029 | 1000 | -035 | -016 | 042  | 029  | 002  | 049  |
| 23    | 102  | 205  | 451  | 508  | -337 | 560  | 418  | 319  | -544 | -371 | 407  | -550 | -457 | -514 | -305 | -291 | -303 | 697  | 021  | 101  | -012 | -033 | 1000 | 747  | -169 | -113 | 219  | 251  |
| 24    | 065  | 117  | 403  | 386  | -238 | 514  | 374  | 276  | -561 | -360 | 335  | -556 | -457 | -466 | -185 | -171 | -185 | 751  | -015 | 097  | 024  | -014 | 746  | 1000 | -076 | -070 | 180  | 193  |
| 25    | -118 | 206  | -123 | -297 | 294  | -141 | -201 | -075 | 043  | 109  | -225 | 064  | 070  | 190  | 253  | 226  | 254  | -123 | -133 | -021 | 105  | 038  | -187 | -089 | 1000 | 638  | -028 | -087 |
| 26    | -159 | -181 | -079 | -165 | 093  | -114 | -170 | -028 | 044  | 092  | -103 | 046  | 077  | 162  | 067  | 063  | 067  | -080 | -169 | -010 | 131  | 024  | -133 | -083 | 653  | 1000 | -004 | -082 |
| 27    | -002 | 004  | 121  | 115  | -046 | 199  | 120  | 089  | -181 | -098 | 124  | -171 | -127 | -127 | -041 | -027 | -039 | 157  | 008  | 086  | 003  | 001  | 214  | 176  | -022 | 002  | 1000 | 639  |
| 28    | 022  | 073  | 137  | 167  | -082 | 221  | 139  | 053  | -155 | -097 | 180  | -164 | -141 | -148 | -071 | -068 | -069 | 191  | 052  | -004 | -038 | 049  | 256  | 197  | -098 | -093 | 637  | 1000 |

Notes. Names associated with scores 1-28 can be found in Table 2. Correlations above the diagonal are observed, while those below the diagonal were corrected for range restriction (Lawley, 1943). Decimal points were omitted.



Model 3 with six first-order factors had a CFI of .908 and a RMSEA of .072, again indicative of an acceptable fit. Models 2 and 3 cannot be tested directly against each other as one is not a proper subset of the other. Therefore, it is inappropriate to compare fit indices between these models. All correlations among the six first-order factors in Model 3 were within the bounds of  $\pm 1.0$ . We prefer this model for its interpretability and its parsimony. Table 4 shows the loadings of the scores on the factors and Table 5 shows the correlations among the first-order

Table 4. Factor Loadings for 6-Factor First-Order Model

| Score        | Factor |      |       |       |      |       |
|--------------|--------|------|-------|-------|------|-------|
|              | I      | II   | III   | IV    | V    | VI    |
| 1. BDSACC    |        |      |       |       |      | -.043 |
| 2. MATHPUT   |        |      |       |       |      | .226  |
| 3. VSCPUT    | .545   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 4. SCDPUT    | .349   |      |       |       |      | .575  |
| 5. SDCIRACC  |        |      |       |       |      | -.959 |
| 6. MTSPUT    | .652   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 7. MANPUT    | .488   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 8. DATSCPUT  | .381   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 9. DATIRTC   |        | .682 |       |       |      |       |
| 10. DATDRTC  |        | .493 |       |       |      |       |
| 11. ASCPUT   | .483   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 12. PFLRTC   |        | .688 |       |       | .085 |       |
| 13. PFNRTC   |        | .570 |       |       | .103 |       |
| 14. PFCRTC   |        | .572 |       |       | .162 |       |
| 15. PFLCOOR  |        |      |       |       | .998 |       |
| 16. PFNCOOR  |        |      |       |       | .935 |       |
| 17. PFCCOOR  |        |      |       |       | .998 |       |
| 18. SATADPUT | .828   |      | -.142 |       |      |       |
| 19. SATDIRUL |        |      | .961  |       |      |       |
| 20. SATDIACC |        |      | .075  |       |      |       |
| 21. SATDIFAI |        |      | -.845 |       |      |       |
| 22. SATDIPER |        |      | .015  |       |      |       |
| 23. SATINPUT |        |      | -.121 |       |      |       |
| 24. SATACPUT |        |      | -.155 |       |      |       |
| 25. DTTAABS  |        |      |       | 1.188 |      |       |
| 26. DTTDABS  |        |      |       | .550  |      |       |
| 27. DTTAPPUT | .244   |      |       |       |      |       |
| 28. DTTDPPUT | .283   |      |       |       |      |       |

Note. Factors I through VI are throughput, response time, shifting attention, tracking, pathfinder, and numeric.



factors. We interpreted the six lower order-factors by ordering the factor loadings of the tests from high to low and determining which tests had the greatest causal influence on the factor (Kim & Mueller, 1978). The first factor was clearly seen to be a measure of throughput; the second, response time; the third, selective attention; the fourth, tracking; the fifth, pathfinder; and the sixth, numerical operations.


Table 5. Correlations among First-Order Factors (6-Factor Model)

| Factor                  | 1       | 2       | 3       | 4       | 5       | 6      |
|-------------------------|---------|---------|---------|---------|---------|--------|
| 1. Thruput              | 1.0000  |         |         |         |         |        |
| 2. Response Time        | -0.9010 | 1.0000  |         |         |         |        |
| 3. Selective Attention  | 0.1624  | -0.0617 | 1.0000  |         |         |        |
| 4. Tracking             | -0.1584 | 0.0854  | -0.0881 | 1.0000  |         |        |
| 5. Pathfinder           | -0.3400 | 0.1553  | -0.0957 | 0.2274  | 1.0000  |        |
| 6. Numerical Operations | 0.4125  | -0.2415 | 0.0577  | -0.2752 | -0.8452 | 1.0000 |

The correlations among the six first-order factors were then used to examine hierarchical models. There are two pairs of strongly correlated factors: throughput and response time and pathfinder and numerical operations. In keeping with previous findings, we tried a model with a single higher order factor and found it to be a poor fit to the data. Given past experience (Carretta & Ree, 1996, 1997; Carretta et al, in press; Ree & Carretta, 1994; Stauffer et al., 1996; Vernon, 1969), it is surprising that the single higher order factor model did not provide a better fit. As shown in Figure 1, the best fitting solution was for two higher order factors that were correlated. The correlation between these two higher order factors was  $-.316$  indicating a shared source of variance and suggests a third level to the hierarchy. However, the existence of only two indicators (2 higher order factors) makes estimation of this third level factor difficult.

These two higher order factors are difficult to interpret. The first of these factors was derived from the throughput, response time, and shifting attention lower order factors. Throughput showed the highest loading on this factor. We have interpreted this factor as a measure of response efficiency. The other higher order factor included tracking, pathfinder, and numeric, with the latter two both having the largest loadings. We had difficulty interpreting this factor, but have labeled it procedural knowledge because of the requirement to apply multiple rules to complete the tests.

To understand the nature of the CogScreen-AE factors, we conducted a qualitative content analysis of the tests using Vernon's (1969) 3-level hierarchical model. Vernon's model has general cognitive ability ( $g$ ) at the highest level and two broad major group factors called  $v:ed$  and  $k:m$  at the second level.  $V:ed$  is a verbal-educational factor and is typified by third-level minor group factors such as verbal and math. The  $k:m$  major group factor, called practical-mechanical is typified by minor group factors such as spatial and manual. This qualitative analysis suggested that only 2 of the 11 CogScreen-AE tests contribute to the  $v:ed$  factor while the remaining 9 are better categorized as measures of  $k:m$ .



**Figure 1.** Factor Structure of the CogScreen-AE Test Battery

The higher order factor structure as determined by our factor analysis does not suggest a Vernon-like structure (Ree & Carretta, 1994; Carretta & Ree, 1997). The response efficiency factor contains tests that can be classified into both of Vernon's broad categories. The same is true of the procedural knowledge factor. These two higher order factors appear to include response modality and response process within each factor. CogScreen-AE offers potential for estimating pilot candidate performance based on these factors.

Kay (1995) offers interpretations of each test score (see his Tables 7 through 17). Because factors aggregate several tests, factors will be more reliable than individual test scores. This increased reliability raises the potential for finding validity for the CogScreen-AE. Carefully conducted validation studies are required to establish its validity and utility for use with pilots.

## REFERENCES

- Benson, A. J., & Gedy, J. L. (1963). *Logical process in the resolution of orientation conflict*, Report No. 259. Farnborough, UK: Royal Air Force, Institute of Aviation Medicine.
- Bentler, P. M. (1990). Comparative fit indexes in structural models. *Psychological Bulletin*, 107, 238-246.
- Browne, M. W., & Cudeck, R. (1993). Alternative ways of assessing model fit. In K. A. Bollen & J. S. Lang (Eds.), *Testing statistical equation models* (pp. 136-162). Newbury Park, CA: Sage.
- Callister, J. D., King, R. E., & Retzlaff, P. D. (1995). *Cognitive assessment of USAF pilot training candidates: Multidimensional Aptitude Battery and CogScreen-Aeromedical Edition* (AL/AO-TR-1995-0125). Brooks AFB, TX: Armstrong Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Directorate, Clinical Sciences Division.
- Carretta, T. R., & Ree, M. J. (1993). Basic Attributes Test: Psychometric equating of a computer-based test. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 3, 189-201.
- Carretta, T. R., & Ree, M. J. (1996). Factor structure of the Air Force Officer Qualifying Test: Analysis and comparison. *Military Psychology*, 8, 29-42.
- Carretta, T. R., & Ree, M. J. (1997). Expanding the nexus of cognitive and psychomotor abilities. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 5, 149-158.
- Carretta, T. R., Retzlaff, P. D., Callister, J. D., & King, R. E. (1998). A comparison of two U. S. Air Force pilot aptitude tests. *Aviation, Space, and Environmental Medicine*, 69, 931-935.
- Hilton, T. F., & Dolgin, D. L. (1991). Pilot selection in the military of the free world. In R. Gal & A. D. Mangelsdorff (Eds.), *Handbook of Military Psychology* (pp. 81-101). NY: Wiley.
- Imhoff, D. L., & Levine, J. H. (1981). *Perceptual-motor and cognitive performance task battery for pilot selection* (AFHRL-TR-80-27). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Manpower and Personnel Division.
- Jackson, D.N., Barton, C.F., & Blokker, H.C. (1992). *User's manual for the Multidimensional Aptitude Battery (MAB) software program*. London, Ontario, Canada: Sigma Assessment Systems.
- Jensen, A. R. (1980). *Bias in mental testing*. NY: The Free Press.
- Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Jöreskog, K., & Sörbom, D. (1996). *LISREL 8: User's reference guide*. Chicago, IL: Scientific Software International.

Kay, G. G. (1995). *CogScreen-AE aeromedical edition professional manual*. Odessa, FL: Psychological Assessment Resources, Inc.

Kim, J., & Mueller, C. W. (1978). *Introduction to factor analysis: What it is and how to do it*. Beverly Hills, CA: Sage.

Lawley, D. N. (1943). A note on Karl Pearson's selection formulae. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of Edinburgh, Section A*, 62, Part 1, 28-30.

North, R. A., & Gopher, D. (1976). Measures of attention as predictors of flight performance. *Human Factors*, 18, 1-14.

Ree, M. J., & Carretta, T. R. (1994). Factor analysis of ASVAB: Confirming a Vernon-like model. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 54, 459-463.

Ree, M. J., & Carretta, T. R. (1996). Central role of g in military pilot selection. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 6, 111-123.

Ree, M. J., & Carretta, T. R. (1998). Computerized testing in the United States Air Force. *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 6, 82-89.

Ree, M. J., Carretta, T. R., Earles, J. A., & Albert, W. (1994). Sign changes when correcting for range restriction: A note on Pearson's and Lawley's selection formulas. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79, 298-301.

Retzlaff, P. D., Callister, J. D., & King, R. E. (1996). *The computerized neuropsychological evaluation of US Air Force Pilots: Clinical procedures and data-based decision* (AL/AO-1996-0107). Brooks AFB, TX: Armstrong Laboratory, Aerospace Medical Directorate, Clinical Sciences Division.

Skinner, J., & Ree, M. J. (1987). *Air Force Officer Qualifying Test (AFOQT): Item and factor analysis of Form*, (AFHRL-TR-86-68). Brooks AFB, TX: Air Force Human Resources Laboratory, Manpower and Personnel Division.

Spearman, C. (1904). "General intelligence," objectively determined and measured. *American Journal of Psychology*, 15, 201-293.

Spinner, B. (1991). Predicting success in primary flying school from the Canadian Automated Pilot Selection System: Derivation and cross-validation. *The International Journal of Aviation Psychology*, 1, 163-180.

Stauffer, J. M., Ree, M. J., & Carretta, T. R. (1996). Cognitive-components tests are not much more than g: An extension of Kyllonen's analyses. *The Journal of General Psychology*, 123, 193-205.

Thorndike, R. L. (1949). *Personnel selection*. NY: Wiley.

Vernon, P. E. (1969). *Intelligence and cultural environment*. London: Methuen.

Wechsler, D. (1981). *Wechsler Adult Intelligence Scale-Revised*. NY: The Psychological Corporation.